

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tom Mccain <tomoly@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 1:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:57  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1100 5TH AVENUE  
SEATTLE WA 98101

Tom McCain  
1722 Timberlake Ct SE  
Lacey, WA 98503-3049

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Paul Talbert <ptalbert@fhcrc.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 1:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:57  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Paul Talbert  
4601 S Brandon St  
Seattle, WA 98118-2355  
(206) 722-8160

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Suneeta Eisenberg <sunilara02@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 1:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its cost assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:57

Suneeta Eisenberg  
129 S 42nd St  
Bellingham, WA 98229-2882

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Janalee Roy <cnovel@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 1:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:58  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Janalee Roy  
4828 Slayden Rd NE  
Tacoma, WA 98422-1859  
(253) 952-6183



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Andrea Fisher  
<andrea.m.fisher@boeing.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 1:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:55  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1000 WEST 10TH AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WA 98101

Andrea Fisher  
820 Cady Rd Apt J204  
Everett, WA 98203-5024  
(206) 276-6926

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jack Burg  
<jack@montlakemousse.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:48 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Jack Burg  
Pioneer Square Box 4005  
Seattle, WA 98194-0005

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Juan Huey-Ray <jhuey\_ray@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:48 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:58

Juan Huey-Ray  
453 25th Ave E  
Seattle, WA 98112-4717  
(206) 418-6789

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of janet mackenzie <jmwm37@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:48 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:58  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

janet mackenzie  
900 University St Apt 14f  
Seattle, WA 98101-2578  
(206) 382-3247



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Timothy Diciara <timdichiara@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:48 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:58

Timothy Dichiara  
4711 SW 244th St  
Vashon, WA 98070-8101  
(206) 304-1299

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Robin Renfro  
<cypnet@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:48 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Robin Renfroe  
10002 Aurora Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98133-9347

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Glen Zorn <gwz@net-zen.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:48 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:59

Glen Zorn  
1463 E Republican St # 358  
Seattle, WA 98112-4517

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of David Leffman <dleffmann@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its cost assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:59

David Leffman  
3337 59th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98116-3004  
(206) 932-3545



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jody Fox <foxjod@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:55

Jody Fox  
4212 35th Ave W Apt B202  
Seattle, WA 98199-1362  
(206) 683-0898

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Patti Allen <pattiallen8@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Patti Allen  
17356 NE 97th Way  
Redmond, WA 98052-8649  
(425) 883-0588

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Karen Sauve <sauve7224@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Karen Sauve  
3413 SE 7th St  
Renton, WA 98058-2890  
(425) 226-2541

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Ted Ebert <ted\_ebert@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:59  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Ted Ebert  
665 Palisades Dr  
Coupeville, WA 98239-9759  
(360) 678-1805



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Justin Clark  
<glitterhawk@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Justin Clark  
6545 Cultus Bay Rd  
Clinton, WA 98236-8629  
(206) 419-6419

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jerry Liebermann <jerry.liebermann@alum.mit.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its cost assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 2:59  
UTC DL Records Center

Jerry Liebermann  
1214 16th Ave E  
Seattle, WA 98112-3313  
(206) 328-0137

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Patti Allen <pattiallen8@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Patti Allen  
17356 NE 97th Way  
Redmond, WA 98052-8649  
(425) 883-0588

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Susan Blake <blakesue@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00

Susan Blake  
8023 S 113th St  
Seattle, WA 98178-3241  
(206) 772-2492



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jean Ferrier  
<grandmacorvid@wavecable.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Jean Ferrier  
5851 Inez St  
Bow, WA 98232-8616  
(360) 766-5263

**Higgins, Joni (UTC)**

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stephanie Iverson <stephiverson@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Stephanie Iverson  
758 Hawkins Ln  
Eastsound, WA 98245-8447

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Trevor Vincent <boxingtrev@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:18 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Trevor Vincent  
1700 E Blackburn Rd  
Mount Vernon, WA 98274-9076  
(360) 428-2100

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Richard Liebert <wwranch@3rivers.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:31 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--

Richard Liebert  
[wwranch@3rivers.net](mailto:wwranch@3rivers.net)  
Eden RR  
Great Falls, MT 59405  
406-736-5791

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Virjeana Brown <[jbrown89531@live.com](mailto:jbrown89531@live.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:17 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--  
Virjeana Brown  
[jbrown89531@live.com](mailto:jbrown89531@live.com)  
720 Northern Pacific Ave.  
Belgrade, MT 59714  
406-388-1833

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Marta Bush <bushmarta246@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:13 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--

Marta Bush  
[bushmarta246@gmail.com](mailto:bushmarta246@gmail.com)  
15650 Brackett Creek Rd  
Bozeman, MT 59715

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00  
RECEIVED  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** John and Martha Stoltenberg <jpstolten@frontier.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:07 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--  
John and Martha Stoltenberg  
[jpstolten@frontier.com](mailto:jpstolten@frontier.com)  
N8362 State Highway 67, P.O. Box 596  
Elkhart Lake, Wisconsin 53020-1828  
920-876-2184

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Bailey Nickel <bailey\_427@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:06 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 5:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Bailey Nickel  
12332b 14th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98125-4816

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Pat Lisoskie <plisoskie@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:06 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years. They need to make it a priority!

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 8:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1000 WEST 4TH AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WA 98101

Pat Lisoskie  
4805 Cushman Rd NE Spc 51  
Olympia, WA 98506-1876  
(360) 754-0909

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Marlene Yallup <marlene@yakama.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Marlene Yallup  
PO Box 325  
Wapato, WA 98951-0325  
(509) 895-3110



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sherry Eiswald <sherrye1@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00

Sherry Eiswald  
22115 5th Dr SE  
Bothell, WA 98021-8262  
(206) 409-9439

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of James Birklid  
<mac4norski@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00

James Birklid  
PO Box 187  
Black Diamond, WA 98010-0187  
(360) 886-1344

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Carol Jimeno <ckj118@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Carol Jimeno  
2811 W Cascade Ave  
Bellingham, WA 98229-2366

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Erin Sanders <erinsan@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Erin Sanders  
4202 11th Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98108-1404



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Chuck Rohrer  
<cerohrer@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Chuck Rohrer  
520 10th Ave E Apt 6  
Seattle, WA 98102-5061

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Johan Luchsinger <luchsingerj@baylisarchitects.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:00  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1000 WEST 4TH AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WA 98101

Johan Luchsinger  
14418186th PI Ne  
Woodinville, WA 98072-6304  
(425) 454-0566

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tiffany Mcrae <cgmtnm@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:07  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Tiffany Mcrae  
212 Adams Ave S  
Eatonville, WA 98328

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Shemayim Elohim <the8th\_chakra@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:01  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Shemayim Elohim  
213 32nd Ave  
Seattle, WA 98122-6327  
(206) 325-3678



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Holly Hudson <hollysbea@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:01

Holly Hudson  
13019 Zeller Rd SE  
Yelm, WA 98597-9212

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Marco Rosaire Conrad-Rossi <marcorosaire@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:11  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Marco Rosaire Conrad-Rossi  
1812 Franklin St SE  
Olympia, WA 98501-2949

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Phyllis Robinson <plrobinson55@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Robinson  
318 N Hodges Rd  
Spokane Valley, WA 99016-9674

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Deborah Parker <firstplanetarian@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:01

Deborah Parker  
2504 Erie St  
Bellingham, WA 98226-4137



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Pam Borso <borsope@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:58 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--

Pam Borso  
[borsope@aol.com](mailto:borsope@aol.com)  
P O Box 154  
Custer, Washington 98240  
360-319-9004

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:01  
COMMUNICATIONS  
UNIT

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Norman Bishop <nabishop@q.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:57 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** 2013 Integrated Resource Plan, Dockets UE-120767 and UG-120768

Dear Commissioners,

I am contacting you as an individual with a great interest in Montana. As you know, Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the single largest owner of the Colstrip coal-fired power plant in Eastern Montana. As an aging coal-fired power plant, Colstrip has several environmental and public health issues that the WUTC should take into consideration when reviewing PSE's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

It's well known that Colstrip's waste-water impoundments have been leaking and contaminating the underlying aquifer for decades. This has had adverse impacts on water quality and agriculture in the area, and recently triggered a \$25 million settlement with 57 affected residents. As you are well aware, the problems of coal ash contamination are a national problem, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is poised to release public health safeguards regarding coal ash. The costs of complying with these public health safeguards should be calculated into PSE's IRP.

PSE should also conduct a full and adequate accounting of the full range of costs associated with complying with air quality regulations such as potential SO2 non-attainment costs, compliance with the Regional Haze rule, and the new federal air toxics rules.

Montana has an abundance of clean and renewable energy sources that create good jobs for our state. These resources could also be valuable for Washington utilities' and ratepayers. For example, Montana's abundant wind energy resource would complement Washington's wind energy. This is because Montana's wind energy peaks in the winter when Washington's wind has slowed and has a lower capacity factor. This balancing capability could help utilities like PSE incorporate more wind into their portfolio, reduce integration costs, and improve grid reliability. These advantages all would help reduce costs to ratepayers.

I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration. Thank you for your time.

--  
Norman Bishop  
[nabishop@q.com](mailto:nabishop@q.com)  
4898 Itana Circle  
Bozeman, MT 59715  
406 582-0597

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:01  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dan Freeman <dan@elementalcorp.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:50 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

2013 AUG 12 PM 9:01

This is yet another reason I voted for a PUD on Whidbey Island and to get PSE out of here. I can't wait for the issue to come up again as people are beginning to see the "real" PSE for what they are, strictly in it for the profit and to hell with the environment.

Sincerely,

Dan Freeman  
4395 Rollinghill Rd  
Clinton, WA 98236-8439  
(360) 341-2345

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Pamela Bendix <pmbendix@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:50 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:01

Pamela Bendix  
7161 NE Hidden Cove Rd  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110-4216

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Scott Cooley <scotttcooley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:49 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:01  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER  
1000 WEST 4TH AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TEL: 206.462.2000  
WWW.UTC.WA.GOV

Scott Cooley  
2217 NW 110th Cir  
Vancouver, WA 98685-4988  
(503) 383-9466



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Helen Gilchrist <gilhegirl@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:49 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Helen Gilchrist  
Mcdonald St  
Olympia, WA 98501  
(360) 753-3588

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Justas Vilgalys <justasvilgalys@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:49 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:11  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Justas Vilgalys  
18320 NE 204th Ct  
Woodinville, WA 98077-6602

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Patrick Mulligan <simsigan@uw.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:49 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:01  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Patrick Mulligan  
539 31st Ave  
Seattle, WA 98122-6321

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kayla Cooper <kaylacordelia86@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:49 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

Kayla Cooper  
2117 N 194th St  
Shoreline, WA 98133-4139  
(253) 753-7482



## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Randall Pearl <rpearl@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:49 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO<sub>2</sub> non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plan and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:01  
UTC DL Records Center

Randall Pearl  
4609 NE 142nd St  
Vancouver, WA 98686-2211

## Higgins, Joni (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Wesley Banks  
<nwgramps@centurylink.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:49 AM  
**To:** UTC DL Records Center  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on Puget Sound Energy Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767)

Aug 12, 2013

Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) WA

Dear (UTC),

I am very disappointed that Puget Sound Energy is planning to continue financing its dirty, dangerous, and increasingly expensive coal plant for another 20 years.

There are cleaner, safer, and less risky alternatives. PSE's plant may require hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up its dirty air, water, and mining waste, and now is the time for PSE to be honest about the true cost of keeping a dying coal plant on life support.

PSE has not accounted for the true cost of burning coal; from carbon pollution to leaky coal ash ponds, PSE has left off coal's big liabilities from the cost-benefit equation. Here are some of the main concerns with PSE's 2013 Integrated Resource Plan (UE-120767):

No price or regulation on carbon for the next 20 years. Although there is currently no carbon cap or tax in Washington, federal or state action is anticipated in the near future, and is almost certain to occur with the next two decades. As President Obama noted a recent speech about climate disruption and carbon pollution: "We limit toxic chemicals in our air and water, but power plants can dump unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the air for free. That's not right, that's not safe, and it needs to stop."

No inclusion of costs for federal designation of coal ash as a hazardous substance. PSE acknowledged previously that the pending Coal Combustion Residual rules could result in up to \$125 million in annual costs for disposal of hazardous coal ash. PSE has already paid \$25 million in a settlement for contaminated groundwater. PSE is currently facing two state-based legal challenges on coal ash and the contamination continues.

No consideration of potential SO2 non-attainment costs and underestimation of other air quality liabilities such as compliance with federal haze rules and new federal air toxics rules.

No accounting for anticipated increasing coal mining costs. Much of the coal remaining onsite after 40 years of mining is increasingly hard to obtain, and will require additional costs.

PSE's planning process lacks transparency. PSE has refused to fully disclose its modeling data or analyses, making it impossible for the public to verify or refute PSE's methodology. In some cases PSE has not justified why its costs assumptions for Colstrip are different from costs documented by the plant's other owners.

PSE's conclusion that Colstrip is "economic" is overly simplistic and misleading. Several of the scenarios that PSE ran showed that continuing to operate Colstrip for the next 20 years is in many cases more expensive than transitioning to other, clean generation alternatives.

This is not where we want our next energy dollars spent. I urge the commission to critically evaluate PSE's long range plant and have them incorporate the true cost of coal.

Sincerely,

2013 AUG 12 PM 3:02  
UTC DL RECORDS CENTER

Wesley Banks  
PO Box 823234  
Vancouver, WA 98682-0067  
(111) 111-1111